WO

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

DISTRICT OF ARIZONA

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

ORDER OF DETENTION PENDING TRIAL

	Carlos	: Wilfre	do Orellana-Pineda	Case Number: _	CR 09-17-PHX-FJM	
	ordance tablished		Bail Reform Act, 18 U.S.C. § 3142(f), a detention hearing has b	een held. I conclude that the following facts	
	-		I convincing evidence the defendant is a danger to the community and require the detention of the defendant in this case.			
	by a preponderance of the evidence the defendant is a flight risk and require the detention of the defendant pending trial it this case.					
			PART I	FINDINGS OF FACT		
	(1)	The defendant has been convicted of a (federal offense)(state or local offense that would have been a federal offense if a circumstance giving rise to federal jurisdiction had existed) that is				
			a crime of violence as defined in 1	8 U.S.C. § 3156(a)(4).		
			an offense for which the maximum	n sentence is life imprisonme	ent or death.	
			an offense for which a maximum t	erm of imprisonment of ten	years or more is prescribed in	
			a felony that was committed after described in 18 U.S.C. § 3142(f)(1	the defendant had been cor	nvicted of two or more prior federal offenses te or local offenses.	
	(2)	The off state o	he offense described in finding 1 was committed while the defendant was on release pending trial for a federal, tate or local offense.			
	(3)	A perio	eriod of not more than five years has elapsed since the (date of conviction)(release of the defendant from risonment) for the offense described in finding 1.			
	(4)	reason	ndings Nos. (1), (2) and (3) establish a rebuttable presumption that no condition or combination of conditions will asonably assure the safety of (an)other person(s) and the community. I further find that the defendant has not butted this presumption.			
			Alte	rnative Findings		
	(1)	There i	s probable cause to believe that the	e defendant has committed	an offense	
			for which a maximum term of impr	risonment of ten years or mo	ore is prescribed in²	
			under 18 U.S.C. § 924(c)			
	(2)	The de	efendant has not rebutted the presons will reasonably assure the appe	sumption established by fine earance of the defendant as	ding 1 that no condition or combination of required and the safety of the community.	
			Alte	rnative Findings		
	(1)		s a serious risk that the defendant v pearance of the defendant as requir		bination of conditions will reasonably assure	
	(2)	No con	dition or combination of conditions	will reasonably assure the s	afety of others and the community.	
	(3)	There i a prosp	s a serious risk that the defendant vocctive witness or juror).	vill (obstruct or attempt to ob	ostruct justice) (threaten, injure, or intimidate	
	(4)					

Insert as applicable: (a) Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. § 801 et seq.); (b) Controlled Substances Import and Export Act (21 U.S.C. § 951 et seq.); or (c) Section 1 of Act of Sept. 15, 1980 (21 U.S.C. § 955a).

Insert as applicable: (a) Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. § 801 et seq.); (b) Controlled Substances Import and Export Act (21 U.S.C. § 951 et seq.); or

⁽c) Section 1 of Act of Sept. 15, 1980 (21 U.S.C. § 955a).

Case 2:09-cr-00017-FJM Document 4 Filed 01/16/09 Page 2 of 3

PART II -- WRITTEN STATEMENT OF REASONS FOR DETENTION (Check one or both, as applicable.)

(2)	I find that a preponderance of the evidence as to risk of flight that:				
×	The defendant is not a citizen of the United States.				
\boxtimes	The defendant, at the time of the charged offense, was in the United States illegally.				
	If released herein, the defendant faces deportation proceedings by the Bureau of Immigration and Cus Enforcement, placing him/her beyond the jurisdiction of this Court.				
	The defendant has no significant contacts in the United States or in the District of Arizona.				
	The defendant has no resources in the United States from which he/she might make a bond reasonably calcuto assure his/her future appearance.				
	The defendant has a prior criminal history.				
	The defendant lives and works in Mexico.				
	The defendant is an amnesty applicant but has no substantial ties in Arizona or in the United States and substantial family ties to Mexico.				
	There is a record of prior failure to appear in court as ordered.				
	The defendant attempted to evade law enforcement contact by fleeing from law enforcement.				
	The defendant is facing a minimum mandatory of incarceration and a maximum of				
The o	defendant does not dispute the information contained in the Pretrial Services Report, except: endant submitted the issue of detention.				

The Court incorporates by reference the findings of the Pretrial Services Agency which were reviewed by the Court at the time of the hearing in this matter.

³ "The rules concerning admissibility of evidence in criminal trials do not apply to the presentation and consideration of information at the [detention] hearing." 18 U.S.C. § 3142(f). See 18 U.S.C. § 3142(g) for the factors to be taken into account.

Case 2:09-cr-00017-FJM Document 4 Filed 01/16/09 Page 3 of 3

PART III -- DIRECTIONS REGARDING DETENTION

The defendant is committed to the custody of the Attorney General or his/her designated representative for confinement in a corrections facility separate, to the extent practicable, from persons awaiting or serving sentences or being held in custody pending appeal. The defendant shall be afforded a reasonable opportunity for private consultation with defense counsel. On order of a court of the United States or on request of an attorney for the Government, the person in charge of the corrections facility shall deliver the defendant to the United States Marshal for the purpose of an appearance in connection with a court proceeding.

PART IV -- APPEALS AND THIRD PARTY RELEASE

IT IS ORDERED that should an appeal of this detention order be filed with the District Court, it is counsel's responsibility to deliver a copy of the motion for review/reconsideration to Pretrial Services at least one day prior to the hearing set before the District Court.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that if a release to a third party is to be considered, it is counsel's responsibility to notify Pretrial Services sufficiently in advance of the hearing before the District Court to allow Pretrial Services an opportunity to interview and investigate the potential third party custodian.

DATED this 16th day of January, 2009.

David K. Duncan United States Magistrate Judge